



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,615

03/01/2004

Ian Charles Matthews

50N3215.01

8847

27774 7590 07/31/2007  
MAYER & WILLIAMS PC  
251 NORTH AVENUE WEST  
2ND FLOOR  
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

ONUAKU, CHRISTOPHER O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/31/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/790,615

**Applicant(s)**

MATTHEWS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Christopher Onuaku

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/30/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 14 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 14, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 14 of this application including a method for processing a plurality of signals, comprising converting an analog signal to a desired format, converting a digital signal to a desired format, demultiplexing a third signal in the desired format, said third signal having an audio component and a video component, packetizing the first, second and third signals, and multiplexing the first, second and third signals into a single transport stream (lines 1-7).

Claim 14 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 14 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 14 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 15, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 15 of this application including storing the single transport stream (line 2).

Claim 15 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 15 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 15 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 16, claim 2 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 16 of this application including buffering the first, second and third signals prior to the packetizing (lines 1-2).

Claim 16 of current application is obvious over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 16 of current application is broader than claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 16 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 2, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 17, claim 3 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 17 of this application including wherein said converting the analog signal comprises demodulating the analog signal, decoding the analog signal to a predetermined format, converting the analog signal in the predetermined format to a digital signal, and encoding the digital signal (lines 1-6).

Claim 17 of current application is obvious over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 17 of current application is broader than claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 17 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 3, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 18, claim 4 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 18 of this application including wherein the desired format comprises an MPEG format (lines 1-2).

Claim 18 of current application is obvious over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 18 of current application is broader than claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 18 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 4, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 19, claim 5 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 19 of this application including further comprising routing the analog and the digital signals from a single device to one or more selected devices for the converting (lines 1-2).

Claim 19 of current application is obvious over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 19 of current application is broader than claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 19 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 5, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 20, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 20 of this application including a selector to select an analog signal, a digital signal and the third signal from among the plurality of signal (lines 1-2). Here the claimed "selector" reads on the claimed "multiplexer" of claim 1, since the analog signal, the digital signal and the third signal have to be selected during the multiplexing function.

Claim 20 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 20 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 20 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 21, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 14 of this application including a an apparatus for processing a plurality of signals, comprising a first converter to convert an analog signal among the plurality of signals to a desired format, a second converter to convert a digital signal among the plurality of signals to the desired format, a demultiplexer to demultiplex a third signal in the desired format among the plurality of signals, said third signal having an audio component and a video component, a packetizer coupled to the demultiplexer, and the first and second converters, said packetizer to packetize the first, second and

Art Unit: 2621

third signals, and a formatter coupled to the packetizer, said formatter to multiplex the first, second and third signals into a single transport stream (lines 1-11).

Claim 21 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 21 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 21 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

10. Claim 22 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 22, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 22 of this application including a source interface having one or more input terminals to receive the plurality of signals of a plurality of different formats (lines 1-3). Here the claimed "source interface ... to receive ..." reads on the claimed "multiplexer" of claim 1, since the analog signal, the digital signal and the third signal have to be received by the multiplexer using the multiplexer receiving interface during the multiplexing function.

Claim 22 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 22 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 22 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.



11. Claim 23 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 23, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 23 of this application including a storage coupled to the formatter to store the single transport stream (line 2).

Claim 23 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 23 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 23 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

12. Claim 24 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 24, claim 5 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 24 of this application including further comprising a selector coupled to the source interface, the demultiplexer, and the first and second converters, said selector to select which of the plurality of signals are sent to each of the demultiplexer and the first and second converters (lines 1-4).

Claim 24 of current application is obvious over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 24 of current application is broader than claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 24 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension

Art Unit: 2621

of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 5, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

13. Claim 25 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 25, claim 2 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 25 of this application including a buffer coupled between the first and second converters and the packetizer (lines 1-2).

Claim 25 of current application is obvious over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 25 of current application is broader than claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 25 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 2, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

14. Claim 26 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 26, claim 3 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 26 of this application including wherein the first converter comprises a demodulator, a decoder coupled to the demodulator, an analog-digital converter coupled to the demodulator, and an encoder coupled between the analog-to-digital converter and the packetizer (lines 1-5).

Claim 26 of current application is obvious over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 26 of current application is broader than claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 26 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 3, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

15. Claim 27 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 27, claim 4 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 18 of this application including wherein the encoder comprises an MPEG encoder (lines 1-2).

Claim 27 of current application is obvious over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 27 of current application is broader than claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 27 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 4, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

16. Claim 28 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 28, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 28 of this application including a method for processing an analog signal, a digital signal and a third signal comprising converting each of the

Art Unit: 2621

analog signal, the digital signal and the third signal into a packetized digital signal, and multiplexing the first, second and third signals into a single transport stream (lines 1-5).

Claim 28 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 28 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 28 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

17. Claim 29 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 29, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 29 of this application including wherein converting comprises converting an analog signal among the three signals to a desired format, converting a digital signal among the three signals to the desired format, demultiplexing a third signal in the desired format among the three signals (lines 1-4).

Claim 29 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 29 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 29 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

Art Unit: 2621

18. Claim 30 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 30, claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 30 of this application including storing the single transport stream (line 2).

Claim 30 of current application is obvious over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 30 of current application is broader than claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 30 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 1, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

19. Claim 31 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 31, claim 2 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 16 of this application including buffering the first, second and third signals prior to the packetizing each of the first, second and third signals (lines 1-2).

Claim 31 of current application is obvious over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 31 of current application is broader than claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 31 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 2, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

Art Unit: 2621

20. Claim 32 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 32, claim 3 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 17 of this application including wherein said converting the analog signal comprises demodulating the analog signal, decoding the analog signal to a predetermined format, converting the analog signal in the predetermined format to a digital signal, and encoding the digital signal (lines 1-6).

Claim 32 of current application is obvious over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 32 of current application is broader than claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 32 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 3, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

21. Claim 33 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493.

Regarding claim 33, claim 4 of the U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 cite the features of claim 33 of this application including wherein the third signal comprises an MPEG formatted signals (lines 1-2).

Claim 33 of current application is obvious over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493 because claim 33 of current application is broader than claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,493. Allowance of claim 33 would result in an unjustified

Art Unit: 2621

time-wise extension of the monopoly previously granted for the invention defined by patent claim 4, therefore obviousness type double patenting is appropriate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

22. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

23. Claims 28&33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Na et al (US 6,504,996).

Regarding claim 28, Na et al disclose digital data transmission, including both an apparatus and a method for transmitting information from a digital versatile disc (DVD) via a network to a device which can display a user interface to control the display DVD information, comprising a method of:

a) converting each of the analog signal, the digital signal and the third signal into a packetized digital signal (see col.5, lines 1-16; where the audio and video constitute the data in the "data TS" (see col.5, lines 14-22); and

b) multiplexing the first, second and third signals into a single transport stream (see col.5, lines 34-52).

Regarding claim 33, Na et al disclose the method wherein the third signal comprises an MPEG formatted signal (see col.5, lines 34-43), here the claimed third signal reads on the data information.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Na et al in view of Shima (US 5,864,649).

Regarding claim 29, Na et al further disclose demultiplexing a third signal in the desired format among the three signals (see Fig.1; CSS decoder 122 descrambles the bit stream provided from the DSP 112, a demultiplexer 124 demultiplexes the descrambled stream into the audio pack, the video pack, the sub-picture pack and the navigation pack (see col.1, line 64 to col.2, line 11), here, the sub-picture data reads on the claimed "third signal".

Na et al fail to explicitly disclose wherein the converting comprises converting an analog signal among the three signals to desired format and converting a digital signal among the three signals to the desired format.



Shima teaches a digital video tape recorder, including apparatus for recording a digital video signal which allows for the simultaneous monitoring of an input analog video signal or an input digital video signal which is digitally recorded on a record medium, comprising the method of:

a) converting an analog signal among the three signals to desired format (see col.4, lines 6-12), here an analog audio signal is supplied to A/D converter 7 which converts the analog audio signal to a digital audio signal; and

b) converting a digital signal among the three signals to the desired format (see col.5, lines 39-53), here the digital video signal is supplied serially to receiver 27 via a digital interface cable which converts the serial data in the digital signal to parallel data.

Converting analog signal and a digital signal among the three signals to the desired formats provides the desirable advantage of converting different signals to their desired format.

It would have been obvious to modify Na et al by realizing Na et al with the proper converting means in order to convert an analog signal and a digital signal to their desired format, as taught by Shima.

Regarding claim 30, Na et al and Shima fail to explicitly disclose the method comprising storing the single transport stream. It is well known to store a transport stream on a storage means. It would have been obvious to modify Na et al by adding a storage means at the proper location in Na et al in order to store the multiplexed audio,

Art Unit: 2621

video and data information single transport data stream, since it is well known to store a transport stream on a storage means.

Regarding claim 31, Na et al discloses the method comprising buffering the first, second and third signals and the packetizing each of the first, second and third signals (see video buffer 260, audio buffer 262 for buffering the video and audio data, respectively, col.6, lines 7-22; and the packetized audio, video and the data information, col.5, lines 34-53). Na et al and Shima fail to explicitly disclose buffering the first, second and third signals before the packetizing. However, the claimed buffering the first, second and third signals before the packetizing process would have been an obvious engineering design consideration depending on the circuit at hand.

Regarding claim 32, Shima discloses the method wherein the converting the analog signal comprises converting that analog signal in the predetermined format to a digital signal and encoding the digital signal (see col.3, line 60 to col.4, line 41).

Na et al and Shima fail to explicitly disclose wherein the converting the analog signal comprises demodulating the analog signal and decoding the analog signal to a predetermined format. Official Notice is taken that converting the analog signal comprises demodulating the analog signal and decoding the analog signal to a predetermined format is well known in the art (see Bingham et al 5,684,799, for example). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary art to demodulate/decode an analog signal to bring the analog signal to its original format, for example. It therefore,

Art Unit: 2621

would have been obvious to further modify Na et al by realizing Na et al with the means to modulate/decode an analog signal in order to bring the analog signal to its original format, for example.

### ***Conclusion***

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bhatt (US 5,610,661) teaches a line scan converter system suitable for use with a high definition image signal.

Shimoda et al (US 5,394,249) teach a multisystem adaptable type signal processing and recording/reproducing apparatus capable of recording various types of input signals and obtaining output signals in various systems in a field of video tape recorders in which various types of recording/reproducing systems are standardized.

Kassatly (US 6,049,694) teaches multipoint video conference system and method including telecommunication systems.


27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Onuaku whose telephone number is 571-272-7379. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
COO  
7/18/07.

  
**JOHN MILLER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**